

REMARKS

Claims 33-53 are pending. Claims 1-32 are cancelled. Claims 33-53 are newly added. Consideration and allowance of the pending Claims is respectfully solicited.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Lin et al. and further in view of Blum et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-14 is now moot as these Claims have been cancelled herein.

Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum et al. further in view of Bowman-Amuah. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 10 is now moot as this Claim has been cancelled herein.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Lin et al. and Blum and further in view of Sridhar et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection Claim 12 is now moot as this Claim has been cancelled herein.

Claims 15-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Blum et al. and further in view of Booth et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection Claims 15-22 and 24 in now moot as these Claims have been cancelled herein.

Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Blum et al. and Booth and further in view of Bowman-Amuah. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection Claim 23 is now moot as these Claims have been cancelled herein.

Claims 25, 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman, Lin et al., Blum et al. and further in view of Booth. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 25, 27-32 is now moot as these Claims have been cancelled herein.

New Claims

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 33 which is drawn to a method for local computer system control of a remote computer system via the Internet. Claim 33 is presented below in it's entirety for the convenience of the Examiner.

33. (new) A method for local computer system control of a remote computer system via the Internet, said method comprising:
 receiving a hypertext transfer protocol formatted command via the Internet from said local computer system, wherein said hypertext transfer protocol formatted command does not include file transfer protocol components;
 translating said hypertext transfer protocol formatted command into file transfer protocol format to form a file transfer protocol formatted command;
 transmitting said file transfer protocol formatted command to said remote computer system via the Internet, wherein said file transfer protocol formatted command is executed by said remote system;
 receiving a file transfer protocol formatted response from said remote computer system via the Internet;
 translating said file transfer protocol formatted response into hypertext transfer protocol format to form a hypertext transfer protocol formatted response; and
 transmitting said hypertext transfer protocol formatted response to said local computer system.

New independent Claims 43 and 53 contain limitations similar to those contained in Claim 33. Claims 34-42 and 44-52 depend from independent Claims 33 and 43 respectively and set forth additional limitations of the Claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references used in the art rejections in the outstanding Office Action, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the embodiment of the invention as is set forth in Claim 33 (Claims 43 and 53 contain similar limitations). In particular, none of the references teach or suggest: (1) receiving a HTTP command from a local system and (2) translating it into an FTP command that is (3) transmitted to and executed on a remote system. Further, none of the references teach that a response is (4) received and then (5) translated into an HTTP response that is transmitted (6) back to the local system as is set forth in Claim 33 (independent Claims 43 and 53 contain similar limitations). Consequently, the cited references alone or in combination do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as is set forth in Claims 33-53.

Conclusion


In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 6/30, 2006


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060